

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Owen Godshall	Team: Squad #15	CCRB Case #: 201905214	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Saturday, 06/15/2019 1:45 AM	Location of Incident: 401 West 207th Street	Precinct: 34	18 Mo. SOL 12/15/2020	EO SOL 8/1/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported Sat, 06/15/2019 12:48 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Sat, 06/15/2019 12:48 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SGT Christian Flores	00752	946996	PBMN SU
2. POM Gerardo Urbaez	02356	947561	030 PCT
3. POM Steven Moran	02932	947275	PBMN SU
4. SGT Jose Perez	04499	935496	PBMN SU

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Anthony Presto	04236	954244	034 PCT
2. POM Jose Tavaréz	02044	949716	PBMN SU

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SGT Jose Perez	Abuse: Sergeant Jose Perez stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
B.SGT Jose Perez	Abuse: Sergeant Jose Perez frisked § 87(2)(b)	
C.SGT Christian Flores	Abuse: Sergeant Christian Flores frisked § 87(2)(b)	
D.SGT Jose Perez	Abuse: Sergeant Jose Perez searched § 87(2)(b)	
E.SGT Christian Flores	Abuse: Sergeant Christian Flores searched § 87(2)(b)	
F.SGT Christian Flores	Abuse: Sergeant Christian Flores interfered with § 87(2)(b)'s use of a recording device.	
G.SGT Jose Perez	Abuse: Sergeant Jose Perez frisked § 87(2)(b)	
H.SGT Christian Flores	Abuse: Sergeant Christian Flores frisked § 87(2)(b)	
I.SGT Jose Perez	Abuse: Sergeant Jose Perez frisked § 87(2)(b)	
J.SGT Christian Flores	Abuse: Sergeant Christian Flores frisked § 87(2)(b)	
K.SGT Jose Perez	Abuse: Sergeant Jose Perez searched § 87(2)(b)	
L.SGT Christian Flores	Abuse: Sergeant Christian Flores searched § 87(2)(b)	
M.SGT Jose Perez	Abuse: Sergeant Jose Perez searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
N.SGT Christian Flores	Abuse: Sergeant Christian Flores seized § 87(2)(b)'s property.	

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
O.SGT Christian Flores	Discourtesy: Sergeant Christian Flores spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
P.POM Gerardo Urbaez	Discourtesy: Police Officer Gerardo Urbaez spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)		

Case Summary

On June 15, 2019, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint on behalf of himself and his friends § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) via the Call Processing System.

At approximately 1:45 a.m. on June 15, 2019, Sergeant Jose Perez, Police Officer Anthony Presto and Police Officer Jose Tavarez of the Patrol Borough Manhattan North Auto Larceny Unit pulled § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) over at 401 West 207th Street in Manhattan (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority – Vehicle stop, unsubstantiated**). The officers requested an additional unit to assist them. Sergeant Christian Flores, Police Officer Gerardo Urbaez and Police Officer Steven Moran, also of the Auto Larceny Unit, responded to the location.

The officers asked the civilians to exit the vehicle one at a time, starting with § 87(2)(b). Police Officer Tavarez frisked § 87(2)(b) when he exited (**Allegations B and C: Abuse of Authority – Frisk, § 87(2)(g)**). He allegedly searched § 87(2)(b) as well (**Allegations D and E: Abuse of Authority – Search, § 87(2)(g)**). § 87(2)(b) started to record the officers using his cell phone. Sergeant Flores allegedly told § 87(2)(b) that he was not allowed to record the incident (**Allegation F: Abuse of Authority – Interference with recording device, § 87(2)(g)**). Afterwards, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were asked out of the vehicle. Police Officer Moran frisked § 87(2)(b) and Police Officer Urbaez frisked § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations G-J: Abuse of Authority – Frisk, § 87(2)(g)**). Police Officer Urbaez also allegedly frisked § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations K and L: Abuse of Authority – Search, § 87(2)(g)**).

Once the civilians exited the vehicle, the officers searched its interior (**Allegation M: Abuse of Authority – Vehicle search, § 87(2)(g)**). While they were doing so, Sergeant Flores told § 87(2)(b) that he would seize his phone because it contained evidence of a crime (**Allegation N: Abuse of Authority – Seizure of property, § 87(2)(g)**). He allegedly called § 87(2)(b) a “dumb fuck,” and Police Officer Urbaez allegedly called him a “smartass” (**Allegations O and P: Discourtesy – Word, § 87(2)(g)**). Later, the officers learned that § 87(2)(b) had an open bench warrant. The officers took him into custody. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were released. Neither was arrested or issued a summons. The officers transported § 87(2)(b) to the 34th Precinct stationhouse for arrest processing. While there, they recovered marijuana from his person. Police Officer Presto issued him a summons for § 87(2)(b) (Board Review #01).

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

The investigation obtained BWC footage recorded by all six officers. It is attached in IAs #68-74 (Board Review #02-08) and summarized in IA #78 (Board Review #09).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Jose Perez stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

§ 87(2)(b) provided a telephone statement on June 19, 2019 (Board Review #10). § 87(2)(b) provided a telephone statement on June 25, 2019 (Board Review #11). § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were interviewed at the CCRB on July 3, 2019. The investigation was unable to obtain a statement from § 87(2)(b) (Board Review #12). Sergeant Flores was interviewed at the CCRB on October 29, 2019. Sergeant Perez was interviewed at the CCRB on December 19, 2019. Police Officer

Urbaz was interviewed at the CCRB on December 26, 2019. Police Officer Moran and Police Officer Presto were interviewed at the CCRB on January 30, 2020. Police Officer Tavarez was interviewed at the CCRB on February 26, 2020.

It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were riding together in an SUV near 401 West 207th Street in Manhattan. They were pulled over by Sergeant Perez, Police Officer Presto and Police Officer Tavarez. § 87(2)(b) was later arrested when it was discovered that he had an active warrant. He was also issued a summons after Police Officer Urbaz recovered marijuana from his person. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) was arrested or issued a summons.

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both denied that they had done anything to warrant being pulled over. They also denied that there were any issues with the condition of the vehicle. None of the officers explained to either civilian why they were pulled over.

Police Officer Presto stated that he decided to pull the SUV over because it had improperly tinted windows. No other factors contributed to his decision. Sergeant Perez stated that he and his partners pulled the SUV over because Police Officer Presto and Police Officer Tavarez told him that they observed the SUV commit some sort of traffic infraction. Sergeant Perez did not see the alleged infraction himself. He did not recall what infraction the officers claimed to have observed. Police Officer Tavarez did not recall why the SUV was pulled over. All three officers stated that § 87(2)(b) the driver, was ultimately not issued a summons because one of the officers decided to exercise their discretion and release him with a warning. Police Officer Presto stated that Sergeant Flores made this decision. The other officers did not recall who made the decision to release § 87(2)(b) without a summons.

Sergeant Flores, Police Officer Moran and Police Officer Urbaz were not present when the SUV was pulled over. None of them recalled being told why the vehicle had been pulled over once they arrived. None of these officers recalled there being any discussion among the officers about whether to issue § 87(2)(b) a summons.

The officers' BWC footage is attached in IAs #68-74 (Board Review #02-08). The officers' footage shows the SUV from several angles. The two front windows are rolled down at the beginning of the recordings. The other windows, including the rear windshield, are shown to be tinted. The exact level of tint cannot be determined from the video. None of the officers are heard on the BWC providing any explanation for the vehicle stop.

New York State Vehicle Traffic Law §375.12-a states that motor vehicles may not be operated with tinted windows that have a light transmittance of less than seventy percent (Board Review #13).

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Jose Perez frisked § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Christian Flores frisked § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Jose Perez searched § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Christian Flores searched § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Jose Perez frisked § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (H) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Christian Flores frisked § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (I) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Jose Perez frisked § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (J) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Christian Flores frisked § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (K) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Jose Perez searched § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (L) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Christian Flores searched § 87(2)(b)
Allegation (M) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Jose Perez searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b)
and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

It is undisputed that after Sergeant Perez, Police Officer Presto and Police Officer Tavarez pulled the civilians over, they requested an additional unit for backup. Sergeant Flores, Police Officer Urbaez and Police Officer Moran responded to the location to assist them. Police Officer Presto told § 87(2)(b) that he detected an odor of marijuana in the vehicle. After the backup officers arrived, the officers asked the civilians to exit the vehicle one at a time. Each civilian was frisked after they exited the vehicle. Police Officer Tavarez frisked § 87(2)(b). Police Officer Moran frisked § 87(2)(b). Police Officer Urbaez frisked § 87(2)(b). Police Officer Tavarez recovered marijuana from § 87(2)(b)'s person at that time. The officers escorted the three civilians to the rear of the vehicle. Sergeant Perez, Police Officer Tavarez and Police Officer Urbaez searched the interior of the SUV, including its trunk. Nothing was removed from the vehicle during this search. § 87(2)(b) marijuana was later recovered when his arrest was processed at the 34th Precinct stationhouse.

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both stated that they were carrying small quantities of marijuana wrapped in plastic bags at the time of the incident. § 87(2)(b) stated that he had smoked marijuana several hours before the incident. § 87(2)(b) denied smoking marijuana prior to the incident. Both civilians denied that there was any odor of marijuana inside the SUV when the officers pulled them over. § 87(2)(b) stated that he invited Police Officer Presto to search his vehicle to prove that there was no marijuana inside. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both stated that the officers who frisked them went on to search them by reaching inside their waistbands.

All the officers except Police Officer Urbaez stated that they detected an odor of marijuana emanating from the SUV. Sergeant Flores and Police Officer Tavarez characterized it as the odor of burning marijuana, while Sergeant Perez identified it as the odor of marijuana in its vegetative states. Police Officer Moran and Police Officer Presto did not know if the odor was of burning or vegetative marijuana. Police Officer Urbaez did not recall detecting any odors emanating from the SUV, including any odor of marijuana.

All the officers except Police Officer Urbaez stated that the civilians were asked to exit the vehicle and then frisked so that they could investigate the odor of marijuana. Police Officer Urbaez did not recall why the civilians were removed from the vehicle or frisked. None of the officers cited any specific observations they made that suggested that the civilians were armed.

The officers denied that the civilians were searched. Police Officer Tavarez stated that he frisked § 87(2)(b) and that he felt an object on his waistband. He did not recall the object's size or shape and did not know what it was. When Police Officer Tavarez asked § 87(2)(b) what the object was, § 87(2)(b) held it out, revealing that it was marijuana. Police Officer Tavarez did not recall how much marijuana there was or how it was packaged. He denied removing the marijuana from § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(b)'s person himself.

All of the officers except Police Officer Urbaez stated that the vehicle was searched to investigate the odor of marijuana coming from within. Police Officer Tavarez also cited his discovery of marijuana on § 87(2)(b)'s person as a factor in the vehicle search. Police Officer Urbaez did not recall why the vehicle was searched.

Police Officer Presto's BWC footage is attached in IA #69 (Board Review #03). At 3:03 into the recording, Police Officer Presto states that he is not concerned with finding marijuana, and that he is looking for "other stuff." He asks § 87(2)(b) if there is anything in the car that he "needs to know about." § 87(2)(b) replies that there is not. Police Officer Presto then asks § 87(2)(b) when he last smoked marijuana in the SUV. § 87(2)(b) replies, "Yesterday." Police Officer Presto remarks that he can smell marijuana. He then tells § 87(2)(b) that he and the passengers will be removed from the vehicle one by one and checked for weapons.

Police Officer Tavarez's, Police Officer Moran's and Police Officer Urbaez's BWC footage is attached in IAs #70, #71 and #73, respectively (Board Review #04-#05, #07). The videos show each officer reaching towards one of the civilians' lower bodies when they exit the SUV. The officers' cameras are not pointed downwards, so they do not show what contact these officers made with the civilians' lower bodies. It is unclear if the officers searched any of the civilians. At 6:50 into Police Officer Tavarez's recording, he asks § 87(2)(b) "What do you have here?" § 87(2)(b) replies, "Marijuana." The video does not show the object that they are referring to.

Property Clerk Invoice #§ 87(2)(b) prepared for § 87(2)(b) arrest, states that a Ziploc bag containing marijuana was found in § 87(2)(b) shoe when he was searched in a holding cell at the 34th Precinct stationhouse. A field test positively identified the substance as marijuana (Board Review #01).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

The odor of marijuana emanating from a vehicle during a valid traffic stop provides officers with probable cause to search the vehicle's occupants as well as the vehicle itself. People v. Chestnut, 36 N.Y.2d 971 (1975) (Board Review #14).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Christian Flores interfered with § 87(2)(b)'s use of a recording device.

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both stated that § 87(2)(b) recorded the officers from inside the SUV when they asked § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle, as well as when Police Officer Tavaréz subsequently frisked and searched § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) stated that as he did so, Sergeant Flores and Police Officer Urbaez both shined their flashlights at § 87(2)(b)'s camera. He interpreted this as an effort to obstruct his recording by causing glare. § 87(2)(b) made no mention of the officers doing this. Both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) stated that Sergeant Flores told § 87(2)(b) to put his phone down. § 87(2)(b) complied with this order.

Sergeant Flores and Police Officer Tavaréz both stated noticed § 87(2)(b) holding his phone up inside the SUV when § 87(2)(b) was asked to exit. They did not know if § 87(2)(b) was using the phone to record the incident. Sergeant Flores stated that he was concerned that § 87(2)(b) might try to harm the officers outside the SUV by throwing the phone at them, so he told § 87(2)(b) to put the phone down. Police Officer Tavaréz stated that Sergeant Flores told § 87(2)(b) to put the phone away to guarantee the officers' safety. Sergeant Flores informed § 87(2)(b) that the NYPD had put out bulletins recently warning them of individuals carrying weapons, such as Tasers, that had been disguised to look like smartphones. Police Officer Tavaréz denied that Sergeant Flores told § 87(2)(b) that he was not allowed to record the incident. Both Sergeant Flores and Police Officer Tavaréz stated that § 87(2)(b) put his phone down after Sergeant Flores ordered him to do so.

Sergeant Perez, Police Officer Urbaez and Police Officer Moran did not recall § 87(2)(b) recording any portion of the incident. Police Officer Presto recalled seeing § 87(2)(b) record using a phone but did not recall any officers telling him to stop recording.

Sergeant Flores' BWC footage is attached in IA #72 (Board Review #06). At 3:05 into the recording, it shows Sergeant Flores standing on the driver's side of the SUV, next to the rear passenger door. § 87(2)(b) is sitting in the SUV's rear-left passenger's seat. The door is closed but the window is rolled down. § 87(2)(b) and Police Officer Tavaréz are both standing next to the driver's door. Sergeant Flores states, "Put the phone down. Alright, that's fine. We got cameras too, but you're part of the stop now. So put the phone down." He shines the flashlight towards § 87(2)(b)'s hand, which is holding up a cell phone. § 87(2)(b) lowers the phone. Sergeant § 87(2)(b) states, "Just put the phone down. Do you understand English?" Sergeant Flores then steps to the rear of the SUV with § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(g)

NYPD Patrol Guide procedure 203-29 states that civilians have a right to lawfully observe and record police activity, including stops. This right to observe and record can be limited for reasons such as the safety of officers or other members of the public, or when a violation of law is committed by the individual or individuals who are recording (Board Review #15).

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (N) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Christian Flores seized § 87(2)(b)'s property.

It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) was arrested during the vehicle stop. Officers took his cell phone into custody, where it was vouchered as arrest evidence. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) was arrested or issued a summons. § 87(2)(b) was found to be in possession of marijuana at the 34th Precinct stationhouse while his arrest was being processed.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he recorded Police Officer Tavarez frisk and search § 87(2)(b) on his cell phone. Later, when § 87(2)(b) moved to the rear of the SUV, Sergeant Flores told him that he was going to take custody of § 87(2)(b) phone because the video that he recorded on it was evidence that § 87(2)(b) had been in possession of marijuana. The officers then placed § 87(2)(b) in handcuffs. They later told § 87(2)(b) that he had an open warrant. § 87(2)(b) phone was taken into police custody with his other belongings. He was released after his arraignment the next morning. § 87(2)(b) phone was not returned with his other belongings because it was held as arrest evidence.

§ 87(2)(b) observed the officers take § 87(2)(b) phones into custody when he was arrested but made no mention of Sergeant Flores or any other officer claiming that the phones contained evidence of a crime.

Sergeant Flores recalled that § 87(2)(b) was holding his phone up when § 87(2)(b) exited the SUV. He did not know if § 87(2)(b) recorded the incident on his phone. He did not recall if officers recovered marijuana from § 87(2)(b). Sergeant Flores did not recall if he and the other officers took § 87(2)(b) phone into custody when the later arrested him. He did not recall telling § 87(2)(b) that his phone would be seized as arrest evidence because he had recorded officers finding marijuana on § 87(2)(b).

Police Officer Tavarez recalled that § 87(2)(b) had two cell phones with him during the incident and that both were taken into custody when § 87(2)(b) was arrested. He did not recall either phone being vouchered specifically as arrest evidence. None of the other officers recalled if § 87(2)(b)'s phone was vouchered. None of the officers recalled § 87(2)(b) phone being seized because it contained video evidence of a crime.

Police Officer Tavarez prepared Property Clerk Invoice #§ 87(2)(b) for § 87(2)(b) arrest (Board Review #01). Sergeant Flores approved the voucher. It lists two cell phones vouchered as arrest evidence. A note states that “the following items did capture the defendant’s arrest on video and may contain evidence on said arrest.” The cell phones were taken into custody on June 15, 2019 and were transferred to the Manhattan Property Clerk’s office on June 20, 2019.

Sergeant Flores reviewed the Property Clerk Invoice during his CCRB interview. When asked why it listed § 87(2)(b) phone as “arrest evidence,” he stated that the phone was possibly categorized that way because it included video footage of § 87(2)(b) own arrest, rather than § 87(2)(b)'s

marijuana.

Sergeant Flores' BWC footage is attached in IA #72 (Board Review #06). At 3:40 into the video, Sergeant Flores speaks to § 87(2)(b) at the rear of the SUV. He tells § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b)'s phone had become "evidence" because it recorded officers recovering "something" on § 87(2)(b)'s person. He tells § 87(2)(b) "Now he's not going to have a phone, because now it has to go to a judge. It depends on what happens with you, whether you get your summons or not." At 4:55 into the recording, § 87(2)(b) walks to the rear of the vehicle. Sergeant Flores tells § 87(2)(b) "Whatever contraband he had in his nuts, guess what? Your phone caught it. So whenever he gets a summons or if he gets arrested, guess what? Now your phone has to go to a judge, because it's evidence."

Sergeant Flores was shown this footage during his CCRB. He did not recall what the "contraband" he mentioned in the video referred to.

NYPD Patrol Guide procedure 218-19 states that property taken into police custody must be documented on a Property Clerk Invoice. Each article must be assigned to the correct property category. Categories include "Arrest Evidence" and "Safekeeping" (Board Review #16).

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

Allegation (O) Discourtesy: Sergeant Christian Flores spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (P) Discourtesy: Police Officer Gerardo Urbaez spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that after he was moved to the rear of the SUV, Sergeant Flores placed him in handcuffs and stated, “You dumb fuck, you could have just put the phone down.” Police Officer Urbaez then asked § 87(2)(b) “You want to be a smartass? You should have kept your mouth shut.”

§ 87(2)(b) initially stated that earlier in the incident, when § 87(2)(b) was recording him from inside the SUV, Sergeant Flores asked § 87(2)(b) “You want to be a dumbass? Recording?” Later, he stated that Sergeant Flores actually asked, “You want to be an asshole?”

All of the officers denied that any officers used profanity towards the civilians during the incident.

A review of all the officers’ BWC footage found that neither Sergeant Flores, Police Officer Urbaez, nor any other officer used profanity at any time during the incident (Board Review #02-08).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) has been a party (Board Review #19).
- § 87(2)(b) has been a party to one previous CCRB complaint and has been named as a victim in one allegation (Board Review #19):
 - § 87(2)(b)
- Sergeant Perez has been a member of the service for fifteen years and has been listed as a subject in one previous CCRB complaint and one allegation, which was substantiated:
 - 201708620 involved a substantiated allegation of refusal to obtain medical treatment. The Board recommended Charges. The NYPD has not yet imposed discipline.
 - § 87(2)(g)

- Sergeant Flores has been a member of the service for eleven years and has been listed as a subject in one previous CCRB complaints and on allegation, which was not substantiated.
§ 87(2)(g)
- Police Officer Urbaz has been a member of the service for eleven years and has been listed as a subject in three previous CCRB complaints and five allegations, two of which were substantiated:
 - 201500911 involved substantiated allegations of frisk and question. The Board recommended that Formalized Training. The NYPD imposed Formalized Training and Command Level Instructions.
 - § 87(2)(g)
- Police Officer Moran has been a member of the service for eleven years and has been listed as a subject in eight previous CCRB complaints and thirteen allegations, one of which was substantiated:
 - 201608020 involved a substantiated physical force allegation. The Board recommended that he receive Formalized Training. The NYPD imposed Formalized Training.
 - § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- A Notice of Claim request was submitted to the NYC Office of the Comptroller on March 9, 2020. The results will be included in the case file upon receipt.
- No records were found for § 87(2)(b) arrest or his summons during this incident (Board Review #20).
- § 87(2)(b)
- § 87(2)(b)
- According to OCA, § 87(2)(b) has no history of convictions in New York City (Board Review #20).

Squad No.: 15

Investigator: Owen Godshall Inv. Owen Godshall 03/24/2020
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: Simon Wang IM Simon Wang 03/24/2020
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Reviewer: _____

Signature Print Title & Name Date